

by President Buchanan on the other. The issue will do well to fight on now, as at any other time, and the people of Kansas, and the sincere advocates of the principles of the Nebraska bill throughout the country, are as ready for it now, as they ever will be. Let it come.'

From the Boston Bee.

DO THE PEOPLE DESIRE THE REMOVAL OF JUDGE LORING?

This is a fair question, and so far as we are concerned, we desire to give it a fair answer. That the conduct of Judge Loring in the Burns rendition case was unjust and unjudiciale, we have no doubt, nor can any man who has read the record of that case. That he violated an express statute of this Commonwealth, in continuing to exercise the functions, both of U. S. Commissioner and of Judge of Probate, he himself admits, and nobody denies; but the question is, upon these facts do the people demand the removal of Judge Loring? They have no hesitation and no doubt in answering this question, 'We do.' We do the people demand the removal of Judge Loring? We do not say that the demand is founded on legal grounds, or that it can be sustained upon principle, but we do say that such is the demand of the people of the State. In this connection, we copy the somewhat supercilious and impudent remarks of the *Journal* on this point:

'The hearing in the Judge Loring case yesterday again illustrates the decided and evident want of "public feeling" in favor of his removal. Wm. Lloyd Garrison, and a negro lawyer named Bradley, were the only persons who appeared to advocate the removal. The former made a characteristic speech, and the latter was delivering himself of a long harangue of little pertinence to the subject of investigation, when he was stopped by the Committee. Of the hundreds of Petitioners whose names had been so ingeniously sought and obtained, representing, it is true, but few men from the community, not a dozen were present at the hearing.'

There can be no doubt that the sentiment of the community is emphatically against the removal of Judge Loring. It is solely among the class who are aptly termed "malignant philanthropists," that the petitions which are now before the Legislature have originated. With this class, personal hatred is the mainspring of political action, and they have hunted Judge Loring, under every effort to remove him, and remonstrated with him, to change the character of his punishment. We much mistake the sentiment of the Legislature, if it does not rebuke their fanatical hatred, and set at rest, at once and forever, this attempt to disturb the tenure of judicial office, either by granting the petitioners leave to withdraw, or by some other pertinent answer.'

Now we deny, in the first place, the statement of the *Journal*, that the show before the Committee is any illustration or indication of the depth and extent of the public feeling in relation to the removal of Judge Loring. The *Journal* knows better than to make any such statement, because it had, when its article was written and published, the memorial presented to the Committee, giving the reason why the petitioners made no more of a show in the way of appearance and argument before the Committee.

The *Journal* also was well aware of the fact that more than ten thousand citizens have petitioned this year, and more than fifty thousand in the aggregate, since this matter was first agitated, for the removal of Judge Loring. Hence when it says, that the fact that only Mr. Garrison and Mr. Bradley appeared for the petitioners, is evidence that the people of Massachusetts, that no magistrate or judicial officer should participate in the extradition of slaves. The sentiment and spirit of that law are as clearly violated, whether that participation is had by a magistrate of Massachusetts, as such, acting under the law of 1793, or by a commissioner of the United States acting under the law of 1850, who sat at the same time as a judicial officer under the laws of this Commonwealth. In conformity with the spirit of this law, the Legislature declared by resolve in 1850, "that the sentiments of the people of Massachusetts, as expressed in their legal enactments in relation to the delivering up of fugitive slaves, remain unchanged," and "that the people of Massachusetts, in the maintenance of their well-known and invincible principles, expect that their officers and representatives will adhere to them at all times, on all occasions, and under all circumstances."

The law of 1855 in a more positive manner recognized the several principles, and applied it to the condition of things existing, in consequence of the law of 1850. In direct contravention of the terms and spirit of this law, Judge Loring now holds the two offices of Judge of Probate and United States Commissioner. Indeed, the whole current of sentiment and law in Massachusetts, during the last fifteen years, has emanated from the fact that no officer of this Commonwealth shall engage in the extradition of slaves, or occupy any office among whose duties such extradition may be counted. The same doctrine has been endorsed and confirmed by the addresses of two Legislatures to the Governor of the Commonwealth for the removal of the judge who has disregarded and violated it.

For these reasons, in the opinion of the Committee, the Legislature is called upon to address the Governor to remove Edward Greeley Loring from the office of Judge of Probate for the County of Suffolk. They do not feel obliged to base the grounds for his removal upon the law of 1855, or indeed to establish the entire validity of those grounds; in their opinion, it is not necessary to regard that law, except so far as it is declaratory of the sentiments of the people. If that law is unconstitutional, it is sufficient to say that its violation is a valid reason for the address. If it is unconstitutional, they hold that the principle so long acknowledged, which dictated its enactment, is also abundantly established.

We do not here say what we think upon the mere question of the technicalities and legal questions involved in the proposed removal of Judge Loring; but we do say most emphatically, that were the bare question of his removal submitted to the people, they would eject him from his office so quick that it would make his head swim; and therefore we say, that the *Journal* is utterly mistaken in regard to the facts, and grossly misrepresents the people of Massachusetts on this question. The people may be wrong about it, but we protest against such a misrepresentation of their wishes and convictions as that which the *Journal* makes.

THE CASE OF JUDGE LORING.

Report of the Joint Special Committee—the Removal of the Judge recommended.

In the Massachusetts House of Representatives, on Tuesday last—

The Joint Special Committee to whom were referred the several petitions for the removal of Edward Greeley Loring from the office of Judge of Probate for the County of Suffolk, have considered the same, and report:

The Constitution provides that "all judicial officers duly appointed, commissioned, and sworn, shall hold their office during good behavior, excepting such, holding whom there is a different provision made in this Constitution provided, nevertheless, the Governor, with consent of the Council, may remove them, upon the address of both houses of the Legislature." The exercise of this right in the hands of the Governor and Council, and the two branches of the Legislature, is unrestricted. Any reasons, unless it be such as are based on misconduct and misadministration in office, which may seem sufficient, will justify removal by address.

In the year 1840, Edward Greeley Loring was appointed Commissioner of the Circuit Court of the United States, "to take affidavits" pursuant to the acts of Congress passed in 1812 and 1817. In 1847 he was appointed Judge of Probate for the County of Suffolk. At that time, under the act of Congress of 1793, jurisdiction in all cases of the extradition of fugitives from service or labor was vested "in any magistrate of a county, city or town corporate." The duties imposed upon a Commissioner at that time, though enlarged by acts of Congress subsequent to 1840, were of such a character that perhaps no valid reason existed why an officer of Judge of Probate and Commissioner of the United States should not be held, and their separate functions discharged, by one and the same person. But by the act of Congress passed in 1850, the jurisdiction in question was transferred to the Commissioners of the United States, and in the language of that act, Edward Greeley Loring, as one of those Commissioners, was "required to exercise and discharge all the powers and duties conferred by this act." This transfer increased the duties and responsibilities of the Commissioner, and so changed their character that the holding of that office became, in the opinion of your Committee, incompatible with the holding of the office of Judge of Probate. A faithful discharge of the duties of the one became inconsistent with the proper discharge, in all cases, of the duties of the other. A single illustration will suggest the conflict which might arise in the exercise of the powers and duties imposed by the two offices. A slave mother dies in Massachusetts, and her children are brought before the Court of Probate for the appointment of a guardian. The Judge of Probate, by the laws of Massachusetts, is for the protection of their protector and friend, and when the hearing is pending, the same Judge, in the capacity of Commissioner, is called upon to issue a warrant for their seizure, as the property of a Southern slave-owner.

Again the Constitution provides that "the Judges of Probate of wills, and for granting letters of administration, shall hold their courts at such place or places, on fixed days, as the convenience of the

people shall require; and the Legislature shall from time to time hereafter appoint such times and places." These times and places have been fixed by the Legislature agreeably to the wants and convenience of the people. It might be argued that the assumption of or occupation by a Judge of Probate, of any office whose duties might interfere with the discharge of his Probate duties at the times and places thus constitutionally prescribed, is improper, and after due notice, is a sufficient cause of removal. It cannot be denied that a judicial officer under the laws of the United States, whose duties are compulsory upon the incumbent, may be incompatible with a judicial office under the laws of Massachusetts, whose duties are no less compulsory. Now no limit is to be presumed to the amount of duties to which the Commissioner may be called upon to perform. If the discharge of the duties of Commissioner were voluntary, under the act of 1850, the mere occupation of the office might be unobjectionable, but in the language of Judge Loring, in his protest of 1853, "the duty of the Commissioners of the Circuit Courts of the United States under the law of 1850 is imperative upon them," and "an application made pursuant to law to any one Commissioner, from time to time, and if such application, he can neither decline or evade it."

It is clear that, even if such applications were rare, they might be made at the very time fixed by the Legislature for the performance of his probate duties, and if numerous, they might prevent their performance altogether. The fact that during the trial of Anthony Burns, such a conflict existed as compelled Judge Loring, in the discharge of his duties as Commissioner, to adjourn the Court of Probate and postpone its business, sufficiently confirm the incompatibility in question.

But the duties of Commissioner, in connection with the extradition of fugitive slaves, are not the only duties which might conflict with the proper discharge of the duties of Judge of Probate. Pursuant to several acts of Congress, passed subsequent to the appointment of Judge Loring as Commissioner in 1840, he is liable to be called to act in cases of extradition of fugitives from justice from foreign countries, and issue warrants and hold preliminary examination, in case of revolts, mutinies and affrays on shipboard, and a great variety of crimes and offenses committed on land and water within the jurisdiction of the United States. These duties enlarge from year to year, and still further in constituting the office of United States Commissioner, such an office cannot, with propriety, be held by a judicial officer under the laws of Massachusetts. When we add to this interference of colored officials with their opposite and conflicting natures, the incompatibility is the more manifest.

This incompatibility has been long since recognized by the laws of the Commonwealth, and the resolves of successive Legislatures. The law of 1843, though applicable to magistrates of this Commonwealth, in the performance of the duties imposed upon them by the act of Congress of 1793, was clearly indicative of the determination of the people of Massachusetts, that no magistrate or judicial officer should participate in the extradition of slaves. The sentiments and spirit of that law are as clearly violated, whether that participation is had by a magistrate of Massachusetts, as such, acting under the law of 1793, or by a commissioner of the United States acting under the law of 1850, who sat at the same time as a judicial officer under the laws of this Commonwealth. In conformity with the spirit of this law, the Legislature declared by resolve in 1850, "that the sentiments of the people of Massachusetts, as expressed in their legal enactments in relation to the delivering up of fugitive slaves, remain unchanged," and "that the people of Massachusetts, in the maintenance of their well-known and invincible principles, expect that their officers and representatives will adhere to them at all times, on all occasions, and under all circumstances."

The law of 1855 in a more positive manner recognized the several principles, and applied it to the condition of things existing, in consequence of the law of 1850. In direct contravention of the terms and spirit of this law, Judge Loring now holds the two offices of Judge of Probate and United States Commissioner. Indeed, the whole current of sentiment and law in Massachusetts, during the last fifteen years, has emanated from the fact that no officer of this Commonwealth shall engage in the extradition of slaves, or occupy any office among whose duties such extradition may be counted.

The same doctrine has been endorsed and confirmed by the addresses of two Legislatures to the Governor of the Commonwealth for the removal of the judge who has disregarded and violated it.

For these reasons, in the opinion of the Committee, the Legislature is called upon to address the Governor to remove Edward Greeley Loring from the office of Judge of Probate for the County of Suffolk. They do not feel obliged to base the grounds for his removal upon the law of 1855, or indeed to establish the entire validity of those grounds; in their opinion, it is not necessary to regard that law, except so far as it is declaratory of the sentiments of the people. If that law is unconstitutional, it is sufficient to say that its violation is a valid reason for the address. If it is unconstitutional, they hold that the principle so long acknowledged, which dictated its enactment, is also abundantly established.

In accordance therewith, there has not been a public celebration of the 5th of March since 1783.

In view of the alarming spread of despotism in these United States—the suppression of Free Speech in one half of the Union—the subjugation of white citizens, and annihilation of the citizenship of Colored Americans, by the Dred Scott Decision, it now seems a timely and significant hour for an application of that sentiment in the Constitution of Massachusetts, which declares "that frequent recurrence to its fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the advantages of liberty, and to maintain a free government."

Eighty-eight years ago, this day, CRISPUS ATTucks, a colored man, led a company of patriots from Dock square into State Street, and in resisting the British forces, received two balls—one in each breast—and fell; he being the first to attack, and himself the first martyr on that day which history has selected as the dawn of the American Revolution.

Ample notice has been given to Judge Loring of the wishes of the people, as expressed through their representatives, and ample time afforded him to respect and yield to them. While Judge of Probate, he still holds the office of United States Commissioner, in defiance of the sentiment of the Commonwealth, and his removal by address is the only remedy which the constitution acknowledges or provides.

Your Committee, therefore, respectfully recommend that the accompanying address be sent to the Governor, requesting him, with the consent of the Council, to remove Edward Greeley Loring from the office of Judge of Probate for the County of Suffolk.

And your Committee further recommend that a joint committee, consisting of two on the part of the Senate and five on the part of the House, be appointed to present said address to the Governor.

Here follows a copy of the

ADDRESS

To His Excellency, Nathaniel P. Banks, Governor of the State of Massachusetts:

The two branches of the Legislature in General Court assembled, respectfully request that your Excellency would be pleased, with the consent of the Council, to remove Edward Greeley Loring from the office of Judge of Probate for the County of Suffolk.

Signed by MESSRS. DAVIS and CORNELL of the Senate, and MESSRS. CHICKILL, STEVENS, PARKER and ARNOLD, of the House.

In making this very satisfactory Report, it is gratifying to state that the Committee were unanimous, with one exception—that of WILLIAM PAGE, of the House, who makes a minority report, adverse to the removal of Judge Loring, on the ground—

First, that the petitioners have failed to make the necessary affidavit, in regard to the reasonable publication of their petition, in accordance with the Act of 1857, relating to applications to the General Court—as if that Act had the remotest bearing upon any case concerning the dignity, honor and sovereignty of the Commonwealth, or to the contumacious violation of its laws! The objection is as ludicrous as it is captious.

Second, that Judge Loring has faithfully and satisfactorily performed the duties of his office. But that is not the question. By the law of the State, he is forbidden to be while acting as Judge of Probate, a Slave Commissioner. That law he refuses to obey. Shall he be permitted to do so with impunity? Had he resigned his office as Commissioner, he would not have been disturbed in his office as Probate Judge. But he is determined to outrage the feelings of the people, and the law of the State, in service fidelity to the Southern slave oligarchy.

Mrs. Page asserts that the Supreme Court of Massachusetts has declared the Fugitive Slave Law to be constitutional. The question has yet to be argued before the Court.

Of course, Mr. Page is ready to hunt and catch every fugitive slave who may come within the limits of the State. The Fugitive Slave Law he thinks ought to be obeyed; and to make its execution a case of official misconduct he says will place us in a condition easily to calculate the value of the Union. Stand from under!

The Liberator.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS.

BOSTON, MARCH 12, 1858.

(Photographically reported for the Liberator, by Mr. YERKINS.)

THE BOSTON MASSACRE, MARCH 5, 1770.

COMMEMORATIVE FESTIVAL IN FANEUIL HALL.

(Photographically reported for the Liberator, by Mr. YERKINS.)

people shall require; and the Legislature shall from time to time hereafter appoint such times and places." These times and places have been fixed by the Legislature agreeably to the wants and convenience of the people. It might be argued that the Judge of Probate, of any office whose duties might interfere with the discharge of his Probate duties at the times and places thus constitutionally prescribed, is improper, and after due notice, is a sufficient cause of removal. Seized a prisoner of war, unarmed, bound hand and foot, and conveyed to a distant country among what to him were worse than cannibals: brutally beaten, half-starved, closely watched by armed men, with no means of knowing their own strength or the strength of their enemies, with no weapons, and without a probability of success. But if the white man will take the trouble to fight the black man in Africa or in Hayti, and fight him as fair as the black man will fight him there—if the black man does not come off victor, I am deceived in his prowess. But take a man, armed or unarmed, from his home, his country, or his friends, and place him among savages, and who is he that would not make good his retreat? Discretion is the better part of valor; but for a man to resist where he knows it will destroy him, shows more hardiness than courage. There have been many Anglo-Saxons and Anglo-Americans enslaved in Africa, but I have never heard that they successfully resisted any government. They always resort to running indiscretions.

The courage of the Anglo-Saxon is best illustrated in his treatment of the negro. A score or two of them can pounce upon a poor negro, tie and beat him, and then call him a coward because he submits. Many of their most brilliant victories have been achieved in the same manner. But the greatest battles which they have fought have been upon paper. We can easily account for this; their trumpet is dead. He died when they used to be exposed for sale in the Roman market, about the time that Cicero cautioned his friend Atticus not to buy them, on account of their stupidity. A little more than half a century ago, this race, in connection with their Celtic neighbors, who have long been considered by themselves, of course, as the bravest soldiers in the world, so far forgot themselves as to attack a few cowardly, stupid negro slaves, who, according to their accounts, had not sense enough to go to bed. And what was the result? Why, sir, the negroes drove them out of their island like so many sheep, and they have never dared to show their faces, except with hat in hand.

Our true and tried friend, Rev. Theodore Parker, said, in his speech at the State House, a few weeks since, that "the stroke of the ax will have settled the question long ago, but the black man would not strike." Mr. Parker makes a very low estimate of the courage of his race, if he means that one, two or three millions of these ignorant and cowardly black slaves could, without means, have brought to their knees five, ten, or twenty millions of intelligent brave men, backed up by a rich oligarchy. But I know of no one who is more familiar with the true character of the Anglo-Saxon than Mr. Parker. I will not dispute this point with him, but I will thank him or any one else to tell us how it could have been done. His remark calls to my mind the day which is to come, when one shall chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight. But when he says that the black man would not strike, I am prepared to say that he does us great injustice. The black man is not a coward. The history of the bloody struggles for freedom in Hayti, in which the blacks whipped the French and the English, and gained their independence, in spite of the perfidy of that villainous First Consul, will be a lasting refutation of the malicious aspersions of our enemies. The history of the struggle for the liberty of the U. S. ought to silence every American calumniator. I have learned that even so late as the Texan war, a number of black men were found silly enough to offer themselves as living sacrifices for our country's shame. A gentleman who delivered a lecture before the New York Legislature, a few years since, whose name I do not now remember, but whose language I give with some precision, said, "In the Revolution, colored soldiers fought side by side with you in your struggle for liberty, and there is not a battle-field from Maine to Georgia that has not been crimsoned with their blood, and whitened with their bones." In 1814, a bill passed the Legislature of New York, accepting the services of 2000 colored volunteers. Many black men served under Commodore McDonough when he conquered on lake Champlain. Many were in the battles of Plattsburgh and Sackett's Harbor, and General Jackson called out colored troops from Louisiana and Alabama, and in a solemn proclamation attested to their fidelity and courage.

The white man contradicts himself who says, that if he were in our situation, he would throw off the yoke. Thirty millions of white men of this proud Caucasian race are at this moment held as slaves, bought and sold with horses and cattle. The iron heel of oppression grinds the masses of all the European races to the dust. They suffer every kind of oppression, and no one dares to open his mouth to protest against it. Even in the Southern portion of this boasted land of liberty, no white man dares advocate so much of the Declaration of Independence as declares that "all men are created free and equal, and have an inalienable right to life, liberty, & happiness."

Ample notice has been given to Judge Loring of the wishes of the people, as expressed through their representatives, and ample time afforded him to respect and yield to them. While Judge of Probate, he still holds the office of United States Commissioner, in defiance of the sentiment of the Commonwealth, and his removal by address is the only remedy which the constitution acknowledges or provides.

Resolved, That the Celebration of the 5th of March, henceforward, shall cease, and that instead thereof, the anniversary of the fourth day of July, 1776 * shall be constantly celebrated by the delivery of a public oration *

* in which the orator shall consider the feelings, manners and principles, which led to this great national event, as well as the important and happy effects, whether general or domestic, which have already, and will for ever, continue to flow from this auspicious epoch.

In accordance therewith, there has not been a public celebration of the 5th of March since 1783.

In view of the alarming spread of despotism in these United States—the suppression of Free Speech in one half of the Union—the subjugation of white citizens, and annihilation of the citizenship of Colored Americans, by the Dred Scott Decision, it now seems a timely and significant hour for an application of that sentiment in the Constitution of Massachusetts, which declares "that frequent recurrence to its fundamental principles is absolutely necessary to preserve the advantages of liberty, and to maintain a free government."

Eighty-eight years ago, this day, CRISPUS ATTucks, a colored man, led a company of patriots from Dock square into State Street, and in resisting the British forces, received two balls—one in each breast—and fell; he being the first to attack, and himself the first martyr on that day which history has selected as the dawn of the American Revolution.

Ample notice has been given to Judge Loring of the wishes of the people, as expressed through their representatives, and ample time afforded him to respect and yield to them. While Judge of Probate, he still holds the office of United States Commissioner, in defiance of the sentiment

MARCH 12.

THE LIBERATOR.

43

the parchment of the
human freedom
is very precious.
That is the
American, Grecian, He-
rean, the freedom there
will be a chance for
it will come. I
the African would
have another; I wish he would

PARKER, is a stand-
John HANCOCK and
John standard, which
it was, of colored
Massachusetts. They were
woman, daughter of
still living in this
it is great esteem,
it dearest names Massa-
it still desire to pos-
this flag and com-
J., then G. W.
COOK embraces Ga-
banishes to the African
only a moment of
for the future.

present relies in this
to call your attention
speak of our old
very ancient history.
I know Mr. NELL
but I believe in
parish books of the
of the year 1775;
somewhat late in the
and woman, bearing the
who was nearly thirty
Revolution itself was
in the Revolution was
! It is often said
lived of all the races
than two thousand
Boston; there are only
of Massachusetts who
and the colored peo-
city—one out of nine
if the whole city of
Boston in point

relic; namely, an old
who was born a slave
to one of the most
State. He was a boy
when the battle of
told tell you, if he was
place, after his coun-
morning of the 19th of
going, to indicate that
Alas ! it was not
a slave then, long
subsequently sold. I
with us to-night.

Mr. PARKER said he
WENDELL PHILLIPS
and American Heroes of
air of 'Our Flag is
Club,' Miss Adelaide
Waxman, after which we
company, as follows:—

ELL PHILLIPS.

in an hour when we
one of the first martyrs
we sometimes tell the
little appreciation of
the first move in the cold
epoch. It is a very easy
would have done;—
strike the first blow. It
out of the ranks of
it is an easy thing to
but this man, whose
night, stepped out of
and, lifted his arm
the government. It is
can do this. To-day,
the whole government
hundred men in arms
that hundred men can-
not willing to risk their
populated behind them.
and on that eventful day
the revolution will find,

CRISPUS ATTUKS was

had their fair share of

XEN., said the Revolu-

think him wrong they
gun heard round the

Who set the example

British soldier that he

first to look into his

March was

made side talk. Revolu-

lace, never with the

foremost rank of

we talk of courage,

clothes of the laborer,

named above, him defi-

revolutionary violence

symbol placed

of WASHINGTON, one

lied, defying the

should come here and

It is right, because

the thing to remember in

All races are one—they

a unit, the Caucasian

is a unit—one. There

in regard to the colored

it is, that millions of it

vote themselves to the

clause.) All literature,

religion, should gravitate

the triumphs of the lit-

erance, whether the col-

ored man, except as

you, as your

eloquent, Industri-

only as an argument that

a place side by side and

I could impress the

and, make pro-slavey

I do not believe in

and eloquent friend

in regard even to the

is a hazardous thing to

dare to differ with so profound a scholar, with so care-
ful a thinker, as THOMAS PARKER; but I cannot accept his argument, and for this reason. He says the Caucasian race, each man of it, would kill twenty men, and enslave twenty more, rather than be a slave; and thence he deduces that the colored race, which suffers slavery here, is not emphatically distinguished for courage. I take issue on that statement. There is no race in the world that has not been enslaved at one period. This very Saxon blood we boast was enslaved for five centuries in Europe. We were slaves, we white people. This very English blood of ours—Saxon—was the peculiar mark of slaves very for six or seven hundred years. The Slavonic race, of which we are a branch, is enslaved by millions to-day in Russia. The French race has been enslaved for centuries. Then add this fact,—no race, not one, ever vindicated its freedom from slavery by the sword. We did not win freedom by the sword; we did not resist, we Saxons. If you go to the catalogue of races that have actually abolished slavery by the sword, the colored race is the only one that has ever yet afforded an instance, and that is St. Domingo. (Applause.) This white race of ours did not vindicate its title to liberty by the sword. The Vikings of England, who were slaves, did not get their own liberty; it was gotten for them. They did not even rise in insurrection—they were quiet; and if in 1290 or 1300 of the Christian era, a black man had landed on the soil of England, and had said, 'This white race don't deserve freedom; don't you see the villainies scattered through Kent, Northumberland and Sussex?—why don't they rise, and cut their masters' throats?'—THE THOMAS PARKERS of that age would have been like the Dr. Rocks of this,—they could not have answered. The only race in history that ever took the sword into their hands, and cut their chains is the black race of St. Domingo. Let that fact go for what it is worth. The village of France and England were won by the progress of commerce, by the growth of free cities, by the education of the people, by the advancement of Christianity. So I think the slavery of the blacks will wear out. I think, therefore, that the simple and limited experiment of three centuries of black slavery is not basis enough for the argument. No, the black man may well scorn such evidence, that the very first man to enter the Court-house door, in the attempt to rescue Anthony Burns, was not, as has been commonly supposed, a white man, but a colored man. Nor was this prominence an accident, but the result of his own headlong and determined courage, at a time when most men around him seemed stricken with a moral paralysis!

With such a fact as this before us, we need not go back to the old revolutionary time for examples. The white men of Massachusetts must not reproach their colored fellow-citizens with want of courage, until they set them a better example. And I will therefore close with the following brief sentiment:—

'The modern Crispus Attacks, at the Court-house door. When he stands there again, may there be more of us to follow him.'

Yours truly,
THOS. WENTWORTH HIGGINSON.
Mr. WM. C. NELL.

The reading of this letter was listened to with deep interest.

Mr. NELL then introduced Wm. LLOYD GARRISON as the man who, in 1829, in Baltimore, sounded the bugle-call of Immediate Emancipation. 'God bless him!' said Mr. NELL. 'May he live to see the jubilee to which his life has been so nobly consecrated!' (Applause.)

REMARKS OF MR. GARRISON.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I believe it is not necessary for me to show my colors on this occasion. Thirty years ago, I unfurled those colors to the breeze, in the sight of the nation, inscribing thereon this motto:—*Immediate and Unconditional Emancipation!—No Compromise with Slavery!—Liberty and Equality for all, without regard to complexion or race!*

Again—in 1777, an act was before the General Court, to secure the personal liberty of every person reading within the State—*as follows:—*

'Whereas, the practice of holding Africans and the children born of them, or any other persons, in slavery, is unjustifiable in a civil government, at a time when they are asserting their natural freedom; wherefore, for preventing such a practice for the future, and enabling the colored people to reside and subsist within the State, the invaluable blessing of liberty—'

It is enacted, by the Council and House of Representa-

tives, that the colored men who are the best defenders of liberty. It is not the men who are ready to take up arms against the tyranny from which they are suffering, who have the highest conceptions of the rights of man, or are best disposed to see that those rights are ever respected. Let us appeal to history. We have Bunker Hill, and Lexington, and Concord, and Yorktown, all for liberty. And with what result? To-night, we have four millions of chat-
slaves in the land, and an omnipotent despotism ruling the whole country. Was there any saving virtue that does not owe more or less to colored
Judge Taney, therefore, stands convicted of grossly falsifying history, and for a most wicked and inhuman purpose.

In regard to the occasion which has brought us here this evening, let me say, that our struggle to give freedom to those in bondage commenced in no spirit of violence, with no desire to stimulate to the shedding of blood, but rather with the hope that, by appealing to the conscience, the understanding and the heart of the nation, by moral instrumentalities alone we should be able, under God, to break every fetter and to terminate the slave system in our land. I still believe that this is our work. If I sincerely hold to anything, it is this: that all human life is sacred—just as the natural right of man to his own liberty, as against all others, is sacred. I am a believer in the omnipotence of peace. It is not the men who are the best defenders of liberty. It is not the men who are ready to take up arms against the tyranny from which they are suffering, who have the highest conceptions of the rights of man, or are best disposed to see that those rights are ever respected. Let us appeal to history. We have Bunker Hill, and Lexington, and Concord, and Yorktown, all for liberty. And with what result? To-night, we have four millions of chat-
slaves in the land, and an omnipotent despotism ruling the whole country. Was there any saving virtue that does not owe more or less to colored
Judge Taney, therefore, stands convicted of grossly falsifying history, and for a most wicked and inhuman purpose.

We are here to enter our indignant protest against the Dred Scott decision—against the infamous Fugitive Slave Law—against all unjust and oppressive enactments, with reference to complexion distinctions—against the alarming aggressions of the Slave Power upon the rights of the people of the North—and especially against the existence of the slave system at the South, from which all these have naturally sprung, as streams of lava from a burning volcano.

We are here to reiterate the self-evident truth of the Declaration of Independence, and to call for their practical enforcement throughout our land. We are here to declare that the men who, like CRISPUS ATTUKS, were ready to lay down their lives to secure American Independence, and the blessings of liberty—

who, in every period of our history, at all times, and in all parts of the country, the land and on the sea,

have ever been prompt in the hour of peril to fill the deadly, imminent breach, pour out their blood like water, and repel the minions of foreign tyranny from our shores—are not the men to be denied the claims of human nature, or the rights of citizenship. Alas! what have they respited for all their patriotic toils and sufferings but contumely, proscription, ostracism? O, shame on this cruelly unjust and most guilty nation! I trust in God that no colored men will ever again be found ready to fight under its banner, however great the danger that mayence it from abroad, until their rights are first secured, and every slave be set free. If they have no scruples in using the sword in defense of liberty, let them at least refuse to draw it in behalf of those who despise and oppress them.

Our work is before us. It is to disseminate light to change public opinion—to plead every man with his neighbor—to insist upon justice—to demand equal rights—to crush out slavery wherever it exists in the land. Let Massachusetts lead the van. Let her be true to the cause of freedom, cost what it may.

She has done well in saying that the Fugitive Slave Law shall not be executed on her soil—at least, not without the intervention of a jury trial. That is one step in the right direction. She has decreed, that none of her official servants shall at the same time be a Slave Commissioner under the United States; and hence the duty of removing Judge Loring for disobedience and contumacy. I am confident we shall all soon have the satisfaction of seeing him walk the plank overboard. (Loud cheering.) But there is one more to be done. Massachusetts must not tolerate a slave-hunter on her soil—not a Slave Commissioner—not allow a human being to be put on trial to decide whether he has a right to himself, or is the property of another—but she must transform every slave into a free man as soon as he comes within her borders. (Renewed cheering.)

Of course, I shall be understood here. While I say that I believe God has called us all to peace—slaveholders as well as slaves,—while I believe in the peace principle, as divine and omnipotent,—nevertheless, I admit, that any man has a right to fight for liberty with deadly weapons, they are to be found on the Southern plantations; for no wrongs are like theirs. I do not hesitate to say, if Washington and his compatriots were justified in taking up arms and wading through a sea of blood to obtain their own freedom, then, by the same inexorable logic, by the same unfeeling rule of justice, those who are enslaved in our country to-day would be also justified in resorting to armed resistance, and in breaking their chains over the heads of their oppressors. What I concede, therefore, to one man, or one race, I concede to all men, to every race. If I disown the slaveholder—

or, if we see a grandson very famous, we say, 'Well, he comes of a good stock; and we remember his grandfather, he could do this thing or the other.' When THOMAS PARKER came into the city of Boston, and made the boldest pulpit in the city, men said, 'It is all right.' This is the blood that fired the first musket at Lexington, and it is only cropping out in a new place. Now, some of you colored men, Boston colored men, go to-morrow and show your valor in the field, valor in life, valor in education, valor in making money, valor in making your mark in the world, and instantly the papers will begin to say—'O, yes! they have always been a brave, gallant people. Was there not ATTUKS in '76? By the by, let us build him a monument.

You must remind us by instances. You must not come to us and argue. That is not the way to convince us. The common people do not stop to argue. You must convince us by a life. We want another ATTUKS; and I will conclude by showing you that you have another ATTUKS. Here is a letter from Mr.

of the friends of humanity throughout the world; most assuredly we have with us the God of the oppressed. What cause have we to despair?

You, my colored fellow-citizens, are eagerly looking forward to the day when you shall be put in full possession of your rights—when there shall be no slavery in our country to afflict your souls, or to excite complexionial hostility. Much depends upon yourselves, in regard to that brighter day which is yet to come. You must not passively submit to the smallest encroachment upon your rights. I am glad that you have rapped at the door of the State House, and presented your memorial to the Legislature, demanding protection as citizens of Massachusetts, and as citizens of the United States, and asking the State to be true to the solemn pledge which it has given, that it will stand by the rights of all the citizens, without regard to complexion, in every emergency. I am glad you have done this, on your plane of action, because it will be sure to command respect. The price of liberty is eternal vigilance. Be on the alert. Go to the State House; let the Representatives look into your faces; let them see that you take a lively interest in the struggle going on, and expect at their hands complete justice.

Judge Taney, in his infamous decision in the Dred Scott case, asserts that when the Declaration of Independence was published to the world, no white man dreamed of regarding slavery with aversion, and that the colored race were looked upon as those who had rights which white men were bound to recognize and respect; and so intimates that, as that was the case in 1776, it must be considered the case now.

To show the bold untruthfulness of Judge Taney, I will read an extract or two from the valuable work of our worthy friend, WILLIAM C. NELL—a work which ought to have the widest circulation for its historical value. Whoever wishes to know what colored men did in the times that tried men's souls, has only to peruse this volume, and he will be equally astonished and gratified with what he will discover in its pages. Let us see if Judge Taney tells the truth. Take the very year in which the Declaration of Independence was given to the world, and what do we find? Here is a resolution, adopted by the House of Representatives of this State, Sept. 13, 1776:—

'Whereas, this House is credibly informed that two negro men, lately brought into this State as prisoners taken on the high seas, are advertised to be sold at Salem, the 17th inst., by public auction.—Resolved. That the selling and enslaving the human species is a direct violation of the natural rights alike of the colored and white men, and that it is inconsistent with the arched principles on which this and the other United States have carried their struggles for liberty, even to the last appeal; and, therefore, that all persons concerned with the said negroes be, and they hereby are, forbidden to sell them, or in any manner to treat them otherwise than they were already ordered for the treatment of prisoners of war taken in the same vessel, or others in the like employ; and if any sale of the said negroes shall be made, it hereby is declared null and void.'

Thus, as early as 1776, we find a full recognition, by the Massachusetts House of Representatives, (which was promptly ratified by the Council), of the equality of the colored race with the white; and action in conformity thereto.

Again—in 1777, an act was before the General Court, to secure the personal liberty of every person reading within the State—*as follows:—*

'Whereas, the practice of holding Africans and the children born of them, or any other persons, in slavery, is unjustifiable in a civil government, at a time when they are asserting their natural freedom; wherefore, for preventing such a practice for the future, and enabling the colored people to reside and subsist within the State, the invaluable blessing of liberty—'

It is enacted, by the Council and House of Representa-

tives, that the colored men who are the best defenders of liberty. It is not the men who are ready to take up arms against the tyranny from which they are suffering, who have the highest conceptions of the rights of man, or are best disposed to see that those rights are ever respected. Let us appeal to history. We have Bunker Hill, and Lexington, and Concord, and Yorktown, all for liberty. And with what result? To-night, we have four millions of chat-
slaves in the land, and an omnipotent despotism ruling the whole country. Was there any saving virtue that does not owe more or less to colored
Judge Taney, therefore, stands convicted of grossly falsifying history, and for a most wicked and inhuman purpose.

In regard to the occasion which has brought us here this evening, let me say, that our struggle to give freedom to those in bondage commenced in no spirit of violence, with no desire to stimulate to the shedding of blood, but rather with the hope that, by appealing to the conscience, the understanding and the heart of the nation, by moral instrumentalities alone we should be able, under God, to break every fetter and to terminate the slave system in our land. I still believe that this is our work. If I sincerely hold to anything, it is this: that all human life is sacred—just as the natural right of man to his own liberty, as against all others, is sacred. I am a believer in the omnipotence of peace. It is not the men who are the best defenders of liberty. It is not the men who are ready to take up arms against the tyranny from which they are suffering, who have the highest conceptions of the rights of man, or are best disposed to see that those rights are ever respected. Let us appeal to history. We have Bunker Hill, and Lexington, and Concord, and Yorktown, all for liberty. And with what result? To-night, we have four millions of chat-
slaves in the land, and an omnipotent despotism ruling the whole country. Was there any saving virtue that does not owe more or less to colored
Judge Taney, therefore, stands convicted of grossly falsifying history, and for a most wicked and inhuman purpose.

We are here to enter our indignant protest against the Dred Scott decision—against the infamous Fugitive Slave Law—against all unjust and oppressive enactments, with reference to complexion distinctions—against the alarming aggressions of the Slave Power upon the rights of the people of the North—and especially against the existence of the slave system at the South, from which all these have naturally sprung, as streams of lava from a burning volcano.

We are here to reiterate the self-evident truth of the Declaration of Independence, and to call for their practical enforcement throughout our land. We are here to declare that the men who, like CRISPUS ATTUKS, were ready to lay down their lives to secure American Independence, and the blessings of liberty—

who, in every period of our history, at all times, and in all parts of the country, the land and on the sea,

POETRY.

For the Liberator.

SENSIBILITY AND PRINCIPLE.
The human heart two lovely sisters sway;
Blest those who their united robes obey:
Beauty and strength, courage and softness meet,
And join to make the character complete.

The elder, Sensibility, how clear
In her soft smiles and tears appear!
Her sweet, benignant features quick express
The joy she feels in others' happiness,
And in that countenance immediate play
Smiles, bright and beaming as the sun's glad ray;
But, at the sight of wrong, or pain, or woe,
Her tears of pity sympathetic flow,
And, like a drooping flower, she weeping bends,
As fair, as helpless, o'er her suffering friends.

The younger, Principle, beheld her stand
Calm and unmoved, with gesture of command!
Courage and firmness in her look appear,
She fears God, and knows no other fear.
No base expedient her actions saves;

Justice and Truth her ready step obey.

A trusty guide thou ever willst find;
Make her thy mistress of thy willing mind;
But be her softer, gentler sister's part
To prompt each kind emotion of thy heart;
Be she thy promptress; were she thy sole guide,

Impulse and feeling would each decide;

Did Principle thy homage claim alone,
The tenderest feelings were to thee unknown;

Let their best influence in thy actions meet,

And join to make thy character complete.

Tenterden, (England.) JANE ASHBY.

HANNAH BINDING SHOES.

A. Rhyme of the Bay State.

By LUCY LAROM.

Poor lone Hannah,
Sitting at the window, binding shoes!

Faded, wrinkled,
Sitting, stitching, in a mournful-muse.

Bright-eyed beauty once was she,
When the bloom was on the tree:

Spring and winter
Hannah's at the window, binding shoes.

Not a neighbor
Passing nod or answer will refuse

To her whisper,
Is there from the fishers any news?

Oh, her heart's a drift with one
On an endless voyage gone!

Night and morning
Hannah's at the window, binding shoes.

Fair young Hannah,
Ben the sun-burnt fisher, gaily goes,

Tall and clever,
For a willing heart and hand he sues:

May-day skies are all aglow,
And the waves are laughing so!

For her wedding
Hannah leaves her window and her shoes.

May is passing;
'Mong the apple boughs a pigeon coos;

Hannah shudders;

For the wild south-wester mischief brews

Round the rocks of Marblehead;

Outward bound, a schooner sped.

Silent, lonesome,
Hannah's at the window, binding shoes.

'Tis November:
Now no tear her wasted cheek bedews.

From Newfoundland

Not a sail returning will she lose,

Whispering hoarsely, 'Fishermen,
Have you, have you heard of Ben?'

Old with watching,
Hannah's at the window, binding shoes.

Twenty winters
Bleach and tear the rugged shore she views.

Twenty-something;
Never one has brought her any news.

Still her dim eyes silently
Chase the white sails o'er the sea.

Hopelike, faithful,
Hannah's at the window, binding shoes.

THE LITTLE MOLES.

By CHARLES MACKAY.

When grasping tyranny offends,
Or angry bigots frown;

When rulers plot, for selfish ends,

To keep the people down;

When statesmen form unholy leagues

To drive the world to war,

When knaves in palaces intrigue

For ribbons or a star;

We raise our heads, survey their deeds,

And cheerfully reply,

Grub, little moles, grub under ground,

There's sunshine in the sky.

When canting hypocrites combine

To curb a freeman's thought,

And hold all doctrines undivine

That hold their canting caught;

When round the narrow pale they plod,

And scornfully assume

That all without are cursed of God,

And justify the doom;

We think of God's eternal love,

And strong in hope reply,

Grub, little moles, grub under ground,

There's sunshine in the sky.

THE WORD.

By SAMUEL LONGFELLOW.

Of Word that broke the stillness first,
Sound on! and never cease,

Till all earth's darkness be made light,

And all her discord peace;

Till wail of woe, and clank of chain,

And brute of battle stilled,

The world, with thy great music's pulse,

O, Word of Love! be thrilled;

Till selfishness, and strife, and wrong,

They summons shall have heard;

And thy creation be complete;

O thou Eternal Word!

[Christian Inquirer.]

The Liberator.

LETTER TO A CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
Recently Established in the West.

DEAR FRIENDS:

Those who seek to make progress, and to aid the progress of others, in the Religious department of human welfare, without discarding reason, or subordinating it to some form of authority, have entered upon a task, not only full of difficulty in itself, but certain to beumbered with such factitious difficulties as the ministers and allies of superstition can create, among which will always be the calumnious reproach of being enemies to religion.

This results from the fact that the thing taught as religion by those who make their livelihood of teaching it, and which is thoughtlessly accepted as religion by churchnings and worldlings alike, consists, in great part, of superstition, which always recognizes itself as most deadly foe.

Every form of religion professed by Jews, Mohammedans and Pagans contains truth mixed with error; every form of religion popularly recognized as Christian contains error mixed with its truth. The way, in both cases, to distinguish the error, and thus to prepare the way for its rejection, is to subject the whole system to free examination by reason.

I beg you, dear friends, to be especially careful to avoid this error and folly. Honor God by practically assuming that no life is pleasing to Him but in proportion to its efforts to secure the welfare of His creatures; and by further assuming that he will infallibly recognize the fitness of such a life, as it passes on from day to day, and understand the motive from which it proceeds, and insure the fulfillment of its appropriate result without your going to an appointed place, to tell Him of it. And if priest or person shall take it upon himself to say that such a spending of the life that now is, is a culpable and dangerous neglect of that which is to come, let him tell him that he is a scholar well prepared himself for the next class by thoroughly devoting himself to the actual study of the present, just so surely will every man and woman best secure the welfare of the next stage of existence by a faithful attention to the daily, ordinary duties of the present. The division of life which we pass in these mortal bodies is too short to be wasted—too serious to have any part of it diverted from solid use to mere show and pretence—and too valuable, alike in its labor and rest, its work and play, to be neglected while we attempt to peep into the recesses of the next mansion that the universal Father has provided for us, or to meditate (however solemnly) on what we shall find when it shall please Him to call us there.

You will not, of course, consider the criticism which I have here made on the empty ceremonies known as 'Public Worship' as implying any objection to the giving of public religious instruction. The community greatly need a teaching which will enable them to distinguish between religion and superstition. The popular ideas and customs make Sunday the most convenient day for preaching, lecturing, or public discussion on religious subjects. That day, of course, will be much more occupied than any other day, except as far as the church services are concerned.

But, strange to say, those who, in lands called Christian are popularly recognized as teachers of the Christian religion, not only claim entire independence of reason in regard to the things which they teach, but reject the arbitration of this faculty, declare it an unsafe guide, and stigmatize it as 'carusal' reason, tending to mislead and ruin those who look to it for guidance in religious matters.

Still more, however, men who are reasonable and discreet in their business transactions, and who would be shocked at the idea of discarding reason from the other affairs of this world, are so imprudent as to receive statements utterly contrary to reason in relation to their religious interests and duties, and so thoughtless as to accept, as a satisfactory explanation and justification of the demand thus made upon their credulity, the statement of the clergy that the matters in question are above reason.

No doubt there are things above and beyond reason—which cannot reach, much less circumscribe or comprehend. But of the things which reason can reach, comprehend and decide upon, there are two classes; one, of things plainly discerned to be in accordance with reason—the other, of things plainly discerned to be opposite to contrary to reason. The class of things plainly comprehended to be contrary to reason is of course entirely different from the class which is incomprehensible, because above reason.

On the other hand, examining by reason the proposition that two and two make four, we find that it is certainly so; again, examining by reason the proposition that one is three, and that three are one—that a wafer is flesh and blood—and that the character of an infant is improved by a parson sprinkling water upon it—we find that these are certainly contrary to reason; the other, of things plainly discerned to be opposite to contrary to reason. The class of things plainly comprehended to be contrary to reason is of course entirely different from the class which is incomprehensible, because above reason.

On the other hand, examining by reason the proposition that two and two make four, we find that it is certainly so; again, examining by reason the proposition that one is three, and that three are one—that a wafer is flesh and blood—and that the character of an infant is improved by a parson sprinkling water upon it—we find that these are certainly contrary to reason; the other, of things plainly discerned to be opposite to contrary to reason. The class of things plainly comprehended to be contrary to reason is of course entirely different from the class which is incomprehensible, because above reason.

If you assume the right of following, yourself, and indicating to others, ideas of religious duty material—varying from the creeds of the popular sects—and especially if you demand a religion in conformity with the reason which God gave for your guidance, and insist that reason shall be the arbiter in regard to every housekeeper. It contains some thirty valuable receipts for really plain cookery, and though a small book, costing only ten cents, is of more real practical value to the housekeeper than any of the larger works which have appeared on this subject. The great fault of books on cookery generally is, that they are not practical; there are few receipts which can be used by ordinary housekeepers in every day cooking; even books which have given directions for reformed cookery have been of this unpractical sort. 'Christianity' ought certainly to be introduced into the kitchen; but the kind which some reformers have sought to introduce is like the popular Christianity of the churches, too expensive to be indulged in by the masses. In the book recently issued by Mrs. Horace Mann—e. g., there is hardly a receipt which does not involve the use of cream. This is undoubtedly a pleasant enough kind of Christianity for those who can reach, comprehend and decide upon it; but the motives which lead to it are not so commendable.

On the other hand, examining by reason the proposition that two and two make four, we find that it is certainly so; again, examining by reason the proposition that one is three, and that three are one—that a wafer is flesh and blood—and that the character of an infant is improved by a parson sprinkling water upon it—we find that these are certainly contrary to reason; the other, of things plainly discerned to be opposite to contrary to reason. The class of things plainly comprehended to be contrary to reason is of course entirely different from the class which is incomprehensible, because above reason.

If you assume the right of following, yourself, and indicating to others, ideas of religious duty material—varying from the creeds of the popular sects—and especially if you demand a religion in conformity with the reason which God gave for your guidance, and insist that reason shall be the arbiter in regard to every housekeeper. It contains some thirty valuable receipts for really plain cookery, and though a small book, costing only ten cents, is of more real practical value to the housekeeper than any of the larger works which have appeared on this subject. The great fault of books on cookery generally is, that they are not practical; there are few receipts which can be used by ordinary housekeepers in every day cooking; even books which have given directions for reformed cookery have been of this unpractical sort. 'Christianity' ought certainly to be introduced into the kitchen; but the kind which some reformers have sought to introduce is like the popular Christianity of the churches, too expensive to be indulged in by the masses. In the book recently issued by Mrs. Horace Mann—e. g., there is hardly a receipt which does not involve the use of cream. This is undoubtedly a pleasant enough kind of Christianity for those who can reach, comprehend and decide upon it; but the motives which lead to it are not so commendable.

On the other hand, examining by reason the proposition that two and two make four, we find that it is certainly so; again, examining by reason the proposition that one is three, and that three are one—that a wafer is flesh and blood—and that the character of an infant is improved by a parson sprinkling water upon it—we find that these are certainly contrary to reason; the other, of things plainly discerned to be opposite to contrary to reason. The class of things plainly comprehended to be contrary to reason is of course entirely different from the class which is incomprehensible, because above reason.

If you assume the right of following, yourself, and indicating to others, ideas of religious duty material—varying from the creeds of the popular sects—and especially if you demand a religion in conformity with the reason which God gave for your guidance, and insist that reason shall be the arbiter in regard to every housekeeper. It contains some thirty valuable receipts for really plain cookery, and though a small book, costing only ten cents, is of more real practical value to the housekeeper than any of the larger works which have appeared on this subject. The great fault of books on cookery generally is, that they are not practical; there are few receipts which can be used by ordinary housekeepers in every day cooking; even books which have given directions for reformed cookery have been of this unpractical sort. 'Christianity' ought certainly to be introduced into the kitchen; but the kind which some reformers have sought to introduce is like the popular Christianity of the churches, too expensive to be indulged in by the masses. In the book recently issued by Mrs. Horace Mann—e. g., there is hardly a receipt which does not involve the use of cream. This is undoubtedly a pleasant enough kind of Christianity for those who can reach, comprehend and decide upon it; but the motives which lead to it are not so commendable.

On the other hand, examining by reason the proposition that two and two make four, we find that it is certainly so; again, examining by reason the proposition that one is three, and that three are one—that a wafer is flesh and blood—and that the character of an infant is improved by a parson sprinkling water upon it—we find that these are certainly contrary to reason; the other, of things plainly discerned to be opposite to contrary to reason. The class of things plainly comprehended to be contrary to reason is of course entirely different from the class which is incomprehensible, because above reason.

If you assume the right of following, yourself, and indicating to others, ideas of religious duty material—varying from the creeds of the popular sects—and especially if you demand a religion in conformity with the reason which God gave for your guidance, and insist that reason shall be the arbiter in regard to every housekeeper. It contains some thirty valuable receipts for really plain cookery, and though a small book, costing only ten cents, is of more real practical value to the housekeeper than any of the larger works which have appeared on this subject. The great fault of books on cookery generally is, that they are not practical; there are few receipts which can be used by ordinary housekeepers in every day cooking; even books which have given directions for reformed cookery have been of this unpractical sort. 'Christianity' ought certainly to be introduced into the kitchen; but the kind which some reformers have sought to introduce is like the popular Christianity of the churches, too expensive to be indulged in by the masses. In the book recently issued by Mrs. Horace Mann—e. g., there is hardly a receipt which does not involve the use of cream. This is undoubtedly a pleasant enough kind of Christianity for those who can reach, comprehend and decide upon it; but the motives which lead to it are not so commendable.

On the other hand, examining by reason the proposition that two and two make four, we find that it is certainly so; again, examining by reason the proposition that one is three, and that three are one—that a wafer is flesh and blood—and that the character of an infant is improved by a parson sprinkling water upon it—we find that these are certainly contrary to reason; the other, of things plainly discerned to be opposite to contrary to reason. The class of things plainly comprehended to be contrary to reason is of course entirely different from the class which is incomprehensible, because above reason.

If you assume the right of following, yourself, and indicating to others, ideas of religious duty material—varying from the creeds of the popular sects—and especially if you demand a religion in conformity with the reason which God gave for your guidance, and insist that reason shall be the arbiter in regard to every housekeeper. It contains some thirty valuable receipts for really plain cookery, and though a small book, costing only ten cents, is of more real practical value to the housekeeper than any of the larger works which have appeared on this subject. The great fault of books on cookery generally is, that they are not practical; there are few receipts which can be used by ordinary housekeepers in every day cooking; even books which have given directions for reformed cookery have been of this unpractical sort. 'Christianity' ought certainly to be introduced into the kitchen; but the kind which some reformers have sought to introduce is like the popular Christianity of the churches, too expensive to be indulged in by the masses. In the book recently issued by Mrs. Horace Mann—e. g., there is hardly a receipt which does not involve the use of cream. This is undoubtedly a pleasant enough kind of Christianity for those who can reach, comprehend and decide upon it; but the motives which lead to it are not so commendable.

On the other hand, examining by reason the proposition that two and two make four, we find that it is certainly so; again, examining by reason the proposition that one is three, and that three are one—that a wafer is flesh and blood—and that the character of an infant is improved by a parson sprinkling water upon it—we find that these are certainly contrary to reason; the other, of things plainly discerned to be opposite to contrary to reason. The class of things plainly comprehended to be contrary to reason is of course entirely different from the class which is incomprehensible, because above reason.

If you assume the right of following, yourself, and indicating to others, ideas of religious duty material—varying from the creeds of the popular sects—and especially if you demand a religion in conformity with the reason which God gave for your guidance, and insist that reason shall be the arbiter in regard to every housekeeper. It contains some thirty valuable receipts for really plain cookery, and though a small book, costing only ten cents,